

REMARKS

Claims 15 to 22 were withdrawn from consideration as being directed to non-elected invention. Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Staeb (US 6,019,714). Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Staeb in view of Kepert et al. (US 5,520,378).

Claims 15 to 22 have been canceled without prejudice.

Reconsideration of the application based on the following is respectfully requested

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Staeb (US 6,019,714).

Claim 10 recites a method for cutting and folding printed products comprising the steps of:

driving with a first motor a first loop for cutting a signature and transferring the signature to a first gripper;

driving with a second motor a second loop for tucking the signature into a first jaw and transferring the signature to a second gripper; and

driving with a third motor a third loop for tucking the signature into a second jaw.

Claim 10 thus requires that the same signature tucked into the first jaw is then tucked into the second jaw. The present invention thus for example can provide a double parallel-folded signature (See page 8, lines 11 to 18 for example of the present specification).

Staeb splits **a stream of signatures** into two product paths (See col, 2, lines 15 to 37 for example) A and B (See Fig. 1). As shown in Fig. 2, a single signature passes **either** to path A **or** path B. The signature itself is not split in two, rather it is the stream of signatures which is split in two.

Thus in Staeb any single signature which is tucked into a first jaw is not tucked into a second jaw, as the signature must already have been tucked into a first jaw according to claim

10. Stab therefore does not drive “with a third motor a third loop for tucking the signature into a second jaw” as claimed.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Staeb in view of Kepert et al. (US 5,520,378).

In view of the above with respect to claim 10, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) thus is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/799,245
Amdt. dated April 19, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 19, 2005

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 

William C. Gehris

Reg. No. 38,156

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC
Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940